REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

2.)   Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Epstein, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,023,510). The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

First, the objective of Eppstein is to provide, to a user, access to data from an information provider such that the user stays anonymous to the information provider.

The objective of the present Application is to provide to a data requesting entity access to data that is related to a principal identifier. By providing the principal identifier to the data providing entity, the principal is known to the data providing entity in so far as the "principal identifier represents the principal towards the data providing entity".

Second, according to Eppstein, the user makes a query Q with Q being relevant medical information of the user (e.g. symptoms, medical images, blood test results, history) in which information from which the user identity might be ascertained is redacted. The information provider receiving the query Q formulates a response R. Hence Q is related to R at the information provider. Thus, information at the information provider of Eppstein has no relation to any user identity. In fact, information is not related to any particular user but to a query Q from which everything from which the user could be identified from has been redacted.

Further, according to Eppstein, for a formulated query, the public key of the user and the private key of the user are generated at the user equipment 12 "for the sole use of said formulated query" (see description and claim 1). The query contains the freshly generated public key of the user. No information at the information provided is related to this public key of the user in advance as the public key of the user is freshly generated for the sole purpose of this query. Furthermore, the public key is solely used for encrypting the response. To summarize, the public key of the user according to Eppstein cannot be used for identification purposes at all and is not used therefore!

In the present Application, the data is related to the principal identifier. Access to data that is related to a particular principal identifier is provided within the limits of the access specification for this particular principal identifier in the access granting ticket.

Further, the principal identifier represents the principal towards the data providing entity, i,e, the data providing entity knows when receiving and processing an access granting ticket comprising a principal identifier the principal as represented by this principal identifier.

Third, in Eppstein, the query is sent from the user equipment 12 to the public terminal 14 and from there to the information provider 18 which then posts the requested information to the public bulletin board 20 from which the user can access this information either from the public terminal 14 or from user equipment 12, in short the flow of information disclosed in Eppstein is as follows:

A) 12->14->18->20->14 or

B) 12->14->18->20->12

In the present Application, the access granting ticket is sent from the principal entity (PE) to the data requesting entity (IRE) to the data providing entity (IPE) which provides access to the data according to the contents of the access granting ticket to the data requesting entity (IRE), in short the flow of information as detailed in Applicant's claims is as follows:

C) PE->IRE->IPE->IRE

Comparing B) with C), it is evident that no access to the information is provided to the public terminal 14, i.e. the public terminal 14 does not qualify for a data requesting entity to which access to the data is provided.

Comparing A) with C), the information is provided to the public terminal 14, however, the information is still encrypted and the public terminal 14 cannot access the information. Hence, also here the public terminal 14 does not qualify for a data requesting entity to which access to the data is provided.

In view of the above arguments and a Declaration from a subject matter expert, Daniel Catrein, supporting the above arguments to be filed subsequent to this submission, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claims 1, 12, 19, 22, and 28-30 are patentable over Epstein. Claims 2-11, 13-18, 20, 21, and 23-27 are patentable at least by virtue of depending from their respective base claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Thomas Bethea, Jr., Reg#53987/

Thomas Bethea, Jr
Registration No. 53,987

Date: May 24, 2010

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4859
thomas.bethea.jr@ericsson.com